

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGY MARA

**TECHNO-ECONOMICS COMPARISON
OF VARIOUS OF WEED CONTROL
APPLICATOR IN OIL PALM
PLANTATION**

MUHAMMAD ZUL FAIZ BIN MOHD ROSLI

Final year project proposal Submitted for partial fulfillment
requirement for the degree of
**Bachelor of Science (Hons) Plantation Technology &
Management**

Faculty of Plantation & Agrotechnology

January 2015

CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this Final Year Project was carried out in accordance with the regulations of Universiti Teknologi MARA. It is original and is the result of my own work, unless otherwise indicated or acknowledged as referenced work. The final year project report has not been submitted to any other academic institution or non academic institution for any other degree or qualification.

In the event that my Final Year Project is found to violate the conditions mention above, I voluntarily waive the right of conferment of my bachelor degree and agree to be subjected to the disciplinary rules and regulations of University Teknologi MARA

Name of Candidate : **MUHAMMAD ZUL FAIZ BIN
MOHD ROSLI**

Candidate's ID No. : 2012610476

Programme : Bachelor of Science (Hons) Plantation
Technology and Management

Faculty : Plantation and Agrotechnology

Title : Techno-Economics Comparison
of Various of Weed Control Applicator
in Oil Palm Plantation

Signature of Candidate : _____

Date : 30 January 2015

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to evaluate the human energy expenditure, heart rate, field capacity and operating cost in oil palm plantation at Pembangunan Pertanian Melaka SDN. BHD. Based on recorded increasing of average of heart rate, conventional knapsack sprayer was found to be most strenuous operation, with an increasing of average of heart rate of 28.13 beats /min. There were significant differences in the increasing of average of heart rates of batteries operated knapsack sprayer and tractor mounted sprayer (power sprayer) with the increasing of average of heart rates for these two field operations being 14.63 and 17.83 beats /min, respectively. There highest average of energy expenditure of 6.90 kcal/ min was observed for conventional knapsack sprayer and the lowest average of energy expenditure of 3.80 kcal/ min was for tractor mounted sprayer. The highest field capacity was recorded for tractor mounted sprayer (Power Sprayer) was about 6.77 acre per hour; while the lowest was recorded for conventional knapsack sprayer (manual) was about 1.40 acre per hour. The results indicate that the average increasing of heart rate Beats / Min was positively linked to the human energy expenditure Kcal/ Min of the subjects, while the human energy expenditure Kcal/ Min was negatively linked to the field capacity. In the operation cost, it indicate that the tractor mounted sprayer was highest that estimated of total operation cost was about RM52.62/ hour, while the lowest was conventional knapsack sprayer (manual) that estimated to be RM9.08/hour .This study demonstrated that usage of farm machinery for field operations was significantly different in human energy expenditure, field capacity, heart rate and operation cost.

TABLE OF CONTENT

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	iv
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENT	vii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF GRAPH	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
 CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of study	1
1.2 Problem statement	3
1.3 Objectives of study	4
1.4 Significant of the study	4
1.5 Hypothesis	4
 CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Weed control	6
2.1.1 Physical and Mechanical control	7
2.1.2 Chemical control	7
2.1.3 Biological control	8
2.1.4 Cultural control	10
2.2 Knapsack Sprayer	11
2.2.1 Nozzle	12
2.2.2 Calibration and Operation	13
2.3 Manual knapsack sprayer	14
2.4 Battery knapsack sprayer	15
2.5 Tractor Boom Sprayer	16
2.6 Physical Environment in Jasin, Melacca	17
2.5.1 Climate	17
2.5.2 Temperature and Humidity	17
2.5.3 Rainfall	17
2.5.4 Sunshine	18
2.7 Expenditure Energy	18
2.8 Machinery costing	20
2.9 Field Capacity	21
 CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Material and Methods	23
3.2 Measurement of Heart Rate and Energy Expenditure during spraying	28
3.3 Measurement of Field Capacity	29
3.4 Statistical Analysis	29
3.5 Measurement of Operating Cost of Sprayer Applicators	30
3.5.1 Fixed Cost (Ownership)	30
3.6.1.1 Depreciation	30
3.6.1.2 Interest	32

3.6.1.3 Taxes, insurance, and housing (TIH)	32
3.5.2 Variable Cost (Operating)	34
3.5.2.1 Repairs cost	34
3.5.2.2 Labor Cost	36
3.5.2.3 Fuel, oil and lubrication costs	38
3.6 Total Operating cost	39
CHAPTER 4 RESULT AND DISCUSSION	
4.1 Measurement of Heart Rate and Energy Expenditure of Sprayer Applicators.	42
4.2 Measurement of Total Field Capacity of Sprayer Applicators.	46
4.3 Average increasing heart rate, energy expenditure, and field capacity of sprayer applicator.	48
4.4 Relationship Average Energy Expenditure with Average Increasing of Heart Rate and Field Capacity	50
4.5 Comparison Cost Operation of Sprayer Applicators	54
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	56
CTED REFERENCES	58
APPENDICES	
APPENDICE 1	62
APPENDICE 2	63
APPENDICE 3	64
APPENDICE 4	65
APPENDICE 5	67
APPENDICE 6	68
APPENDICE 7	69
GANTT CHART	77
CURRICULUM VITAE	78